RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 25 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No.	:	09/456,689
Applicant(s)	:	MICHAEL S. PASIEKA
Filed	:	DECEMBER 9, 1999
C.No./A.U.	:	6774 / 2136
Examiner	:	PARTHASARATHY, P.
Atty. Docket	:	PHA 23871

```
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I certify that this correspondence consisting of
7 pages is being transmitted by facsimile to the
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office at (571)
273-8300

On:  25 September 2006

By: _____
         Dicran Halajian
```

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR REVOCATION LIST MANAGEMENT

APPLICANTS' REPLY BRIEF

Mail Stop **Appeal Brief-Patents**
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Answer of August 11, 2006, please consider the following remarks. Please charge Deposit Account No. 50-3649 for any required extension of time or excess claim fees for filing this paper.

This paper includes (each beginning on a separate sheet):

1. **Remarks / Discussion of issues; and**
2. **The claims on appeal.**

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Appellant maintains the arguments submitted in the Appeal Brief mailed on May 26, 2006, which are incorporated herein by reference and refute the allegations made in the Examiner's Answer. In particular, Appellant respectfully refutes the allegation on page 10, lines 1-2 of the Examiner's Answer that defines the contact list as the list of digital certificates reciting:

> The Clearing house maintains a list of digital <u>certificates</u> (Contact list) that are <u>issued to a valid entity</u>. (Emphasis added)

It is respectfully submitted that the present invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 17, and similarly recited in independent claim 16, amongst other patentable elements, requires:

> a <u>contact list</u> comprising information identifying one or more other entities which have **attempted** to communicate with the given entity. (Illustrative emphasis added)

A contact list comprising information identifying one or more other entities which have **attempted** to communicate with the given entity is nowhere taught or suggested in Gruse. Further, the list of digital certificates maintained by the Gruse clearinghouse is NOT a contact list of entities which have **attempted** to communicate with the given entity. Rather, as correctly noted by the Examiner in the very same sentence on page 10, lines 1-2 of the Examiner's Answer reproduced above, the list of digital certificates is <u>issued by the Gruse clearinghouse to a valid entity</u>. Column 45, lines 4-5 of Gruse specifically recite that:

> The Clearinghouse(s) 105 maintains a database of digital certificates that **it has assigned**. (Emphasis added)

Even assuming, arguendo, that the Gruse clearinghouse maintains a contact list of entities communicated with, it is still respectfully submitted that does not teach or suggest a contact list of entities which have **attempted** to communicate with the given entity, as recited in independent claims 1 and 16-17.

PHA-23871-Reply-6.811-HAL.doc   Atty. Docket No. PHA 23871

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 16-17 are allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-15 and 18-20 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 16-17.

In addition, Appellant denies any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Appellant reserves the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Appellant
September 25, 2006

Appendix: Claims 1-20

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101

PHA-23871-Reply-6.811-HAL.doc   Atty. Docket No. PHA 23871

Appl. No. 09/456,689   Page 4 of 7
Reply Brief
Reply to Examiner's Answer of August 11, 2006   RECEIVED
                                                        CENTRAL FAX CENTER

                                                            SEP 2 5 2006

THE CLAIMS ON APPEAL

1.(Original) A method for controlling access to information, the method comprising the steps of:

maintaining, for a given entity controlling access to the information, a contact list comprising information identifying one or more other entities which have attempted to communicate with the given entity; and

utilizing the contact list in conjunction with a revocation list associated with the given entity to determine which of at least a subset of the one or more other entities are authorized to communicate with the given entity.

2.(Original) The method of claim 1 wherein the given entity and at least a subset of the one or more other entities each comprise a consumer electronics device.

3.(Original) The method of claim 1 wherein the maintaining and utilizing steps are implemented in an access control system associated with the given entity.

4.(Original) The method of claim 3 wherein the revocation list comprises a local revocation list stored in the access control system.

5.(Original) The method of claim 1 wherein the contact list comprises a plurality of entries, each entry including at least an identifier of a particular one of the other entities and a corresponding revocation flag indicating whether authorization of the particular entity has been revoked.

6.(Original) The method of claim 5 further including the step of updating the contact list after a modification of the revocation list.

7.(Previously presented) The method of claim 6 wherein the step of updating the contact list after a modification of the revocation list further includes the steps of:

identifying all of the entities in the contact list that do not have their corresponding revocation flag set; and

determining, for each of the entities identified as being on the contact list but not having a set revocation flag, whether that entity is on a modified local revocation list, and if such an entity is determined to be on the modified local revocation list, setting its revocation flag in the contact list.

8.(Original) The method of claim 5 further including the step of updating the contact list if a new entity not already included in the contact list attempts to communicate with the given entity.

9.(Original) The method of claim 8 wherein the step of updating the contact list if a new entity not already included in the contact list attempts to communicate with the given entity further includes the steps of:

storing in the contact list an entity identifier for the new entity if there is sufficient space available in the contact list; and

determining if the new entity is on the revocation list, and if it is, setting the corresponding revocation flag for the new entity in the contact list.

10.(Original) The method of claim 9 further including the step of selecting a particular entry of the contact list for removal from the contact list if there is not sufficient space available in the contact list for the new entity.

11.(Original) The method of claim 10 wherein the selecting step is implemented using a random or pseudo-random selection process.

12.(Original) The method of claim 5 wherein the contact list is configured such that the revocation flag of a particular entry may not be cleared once that flag has been set as long as that entry remains in the contact list.

13.(Original) The method of claim 1 further including the step of periodically generating a digital signature for at least a portion of the contact list.

14.(Original) The method of claim 13 further including the step of updating the digital signature each time the contact list is updated.

15.(Original) The method of claim 1 wherein each of at least a subset of the other entities stores a contact list having entries corresponding to entities which have attempted to communicate with those other entities.

16.(Original) An apparatus for controlling access to information, the apparatus comprising:

a processor-based device for controlling access to the information, wherein the processor-based device is operative to maintain a contact list comprising information identifying one or more other entities which have attempted to communicate with the processor-based device, and to utilize the contact list in conjunction with a revocation list associated with the given entity to determine which of at least a subset of the one or more other entities are authorized to communicate with the processor-based device.

17.(Original) An article of manufacture comprising a machine-readable storage medium containing one or more software programs for use in controlling access to information, wherein the programs when executed implement the steps of:

maintaining, for a given entity controlling access to the information, a contact list comprising information identifying one or more other entities which have attempted to communicate with the given entity; and

PHA-23871-Reply-6.811-HAL.doc   Atty. Docket No. PHA 23871

utilizing the contact list in conjunction with a revocation list associated with the given entity to determine which of at least a subset of the one or more other entities are authorized to communicate with the given entity.

18.   (Previously presented) The apparatus of Claim 16, wherein the contact list comprises a plurality of entries, each entry including at least an identifier of a particular one of the other entities and a corresponding revocation flag indicating whether authorization of the particular entity has been revoked.

19.(Previously presented) The article of manufacture of Claim 17, wherein the contact list comprises a plurality of entries, each entry including at least an identifier of a particular one of the other entities and a corresponding revocation flag indicating whether authorization of the particular entity has been revoked.

20.(Previously presented) The article of manufacture of Claim 19, wherein the programs when executed implement the further step of updating the contact list after a modification of the revocation list.

PHA-23871-Reply-6 811-HAL.doc   Atty. Docket No. PHA 23871